

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2010-09-16
Date of Last Change to Activities:
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-06-22
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-07-24
Date of Last Revision: 2012-08-15

Agency: 010 - Department of the Interior **Bureau:** 24 - National Park Service

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: NPS - PPFL - Enterprise Facility Management Software System

2. Unique Investment Identifier (Ull): 010-000000578

Section B: Investment Detail

- 1. Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

The Enterprise Facility Management Software System (EFMSS) provides the National Park Service (NPS) with a centralized tool for Asset Management Reform. FMSS is an asset-based work identification, planning, management, and analysis program. It contains the entire NPS inventory data universe of more than 70,000 assets and over 1.6 million work orders used by NPS units to track and manage work. This "cradle to grave" asset and work management system allows a park, region or Washington Area Support Office (WASO) to track all aspects of work related to a specific asset; such as planning and design, construction, operations/maintenance, rehabilitation and removal. The enterprise system has approximately 36 interrelated systems and applications. The core component of FMSS is a customized version of the IBM Maximo software product; the requirements stated for the EFMSS include the IT costs associated with the core applications and the additional cost to facilitate the interface between the core system and corollary systems (but not the cost to run the corollary systems and programs in their entirety). Examples of the associated applications and systems include Maximo, Citrix, Project Management Information System, Cost Estimating Software System, Web CRV Calculator, Asset Management Report System, Condition Assessment Website, and Asset Priority Index. Primary beneficiaries include end users such as Park and Regional Staff, PFMD, and Agency, Department and Other Key Stakeholders. EFMSS enables end users to focus on work management and planning using

the system to track and manage work more efficiently.

2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.

This investment allows the NPS to implement a systematic process to identify, prioritize and manage the backlog of maintenance tasks and to measure the overall change in asset conditions based upon work accomplished or deferred. In short, without EFMSS NPS cannot accurately and consistently record and track its real property inventory and define the associated annual and life cycle costs associated with managing this \$204 billion valued inventory. The increased speed and efficiency in data collection and information dissemination that EFMSS enables allows the NPS to better plan and prioritize work, document the utilization of resources, measure and evaluate results, and identify report needs, progress and accomplishments. EFMSS's utilization of a centralized database and web based system generates significant time and cost savings in system administration, data gathering, quality assurance, and information sharing. If this investment isn't fully funded, strategic asset management processes would suffer and result in the following: Accuracy of the NPS facility data would be compromised; Parks would be unable to effectively organize, document, and manage the O&M involved to manage their portfolio of assets resulting in a diminished visitor experience; PFMD would be unable to address current DOI initiatives, including FBMS and others; PFMD would lack the ability to meet current reporting requirements, including Federal Real Property (FRP), FASAB, DOI and NPS Budget and Greenbook requests, and PART.

3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.

Prior Year (PY) accomplishments include continued use of critical facilities data to inform project decision making (Project Scoping Tool), the stand up and effective functioning of a four tiered governance process to review EFMSS changes prior to release, and ongoing improvements to other critical process and technology including the Roads Portal and NPS's Cost Estimating Software.

4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).

Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY) accomplishments include Maximo versioning and continued patch deployments, system support data migration, Roads Portal/FHWA alignment, continued use of critical facilities data to inform project decision making (Project Scoping Tool), FMSS platform monitoring, FBMS support, and gaining greater system efficiency and eliciting customer input to drive requirements.

5. Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve

this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.

2011-08-31

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.7	\$0.5
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.7	\$0.5
O & M Costs:	\$6.2	\$6.5	\$7.3	\$8.1
O & M Govt. FTEs:	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$1.2
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	\$7.3	\$7.6	\$8.4	\$9.3
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	\$7.8	\$8.1	\$9.1	\$9.8
Total Govt. FTE costs:	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$1.2
# of FTE rep by costs:	9	9	9	9
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$)		\$0.0	\$0.5	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		0.00%	5.80%	

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

A change in funding from the President's Budget is being reported due to the following.

Contributing to this increase are the following: 1) changes in scheduled of proposed Maximo upgrade, 2) reconfiguration of FMSS for FBMS, and 3) revised O&M estimates.

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value (\$M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
---------------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------------------------	------	--------	----------------	-----------------------------

Awarded

[INPP11PC701](#)
[33](#)
2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

NPS uses a variety of contract types. Performance standards are required and maintained for many NPS contracts. Each Contracting Officer establishes a set of performance metrics and manages their contracts in accordance with these set of performance measures.

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities:

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects					
Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M)
NONE					

Activity Summary								
Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities								
Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
NONE								

Key Deliverables								
Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)
NONE								

Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
Percent of customers who report being satisfied with the EFMSS	Percent	Customer Results - Customer Benefit	Under target	84.000000	80.000000	76.000000	80.000000	Semi-Annual
The frequency with which customers report having their questions to the help desk sufficiently answered	Percent	Mission and Business Results - Management of Government Resources	Over target	84.000000	80.000000	89.000000	80.000000	Semi-Annual
Overall PFMD risk rating for all risks in the EFMSS Risk Register (based on the weighted average on a 1 [low] - 100 [high] scale, as defined by PFMD	1-100	Process and Activities - Management and Innovation	Under target	33.000000	40.000000	33.000000	40.000000	Semi-Annual
Have a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) certified system and pass the C&A - pass =1; fail = 0	0-1	Process and Activities - Security and Privacy	Over target	1.000000	1.000000	1.000000	1.000000	Semi-Annual
Percent of the time Maximo is up and running during the normal work week (Mon - Fri)	Percent	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Over target	98.000000	90.000000	98.000000	90.000000	Monthly
Percent of Maximo downtime that is due to unplanned outages (hardware, software, unplanned maintenance, and power failures)	Percent	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Under target	1.000000	5.000000	0.500000	5.000000	Monthly